

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and entry of the above amendments and these remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 19 and 22 have been amended. Claim 23 has been canceled. Claims 14-19, 22 and 24 are pending.

Applicants again note that inventors Cohen and Michioka have been removed in the paper filed on September 7, 2004. Thus, Applicants request the Examiner to change the First Named Inventor to "Pace".

Claims 14-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 19 and 22 have been carefully reviewed and revised bearing in mind the Examiner's rejection. It is submitted that all pending claims are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 14-18 and 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Naitoh et al. Claims 19 and 22 have been amended to define the invention more clearly and thus, obviate the rejection. In particular, each of claims 19 and 22 recites that the plurality of passages includes at least four passages in the seat with ends of the passages being on a common plane. An angle between centers of adjacent ends is substantially 90 degrees. This is clearly shown in Figs. 6 and 7 of the specification.

None of the embodiments of Naitoh disclose ends of passages on a common plane and angles between centers of the ends being substantially 90 degrees. For example, Figs. 14, 37, 42, 46 and 48 of Naitoh show the angle between centers of adjacent ends of the passages to be 180 degrees. In Fig. 54 of Naitoh, the ends of the passages 212a, 212b, 212c and 212d are not on a common plane since they are on a surface of a cone 211b. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 23 is now moot since claim 23 has been canceled.

Claims 14-19 and 22-24 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13-19 and 22-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,799,733. Due to the amendment of claims 19 and 22 above, this rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner contends that the claims are not patentably distinct from the claims of the '733 patent. Due to the amendment of claims

19 and 22, the Examiner's contention is no longer accurate. Each claim of the '733 patent requires that "each central axis (of a passage) intersects the longitudinal central axis and each other at a common point on the longitudinal axis". This embodiment is clearly shown in Figs. 3A and 3B of the specification, but is not the embodiment that is currently claimed in this application. The claims herein recite four passages and cover the embodiments of Figs. 6 and 7 of the specification. There is no suggestion in the claims of the '733 patent that the angle between centers of adjacent passage ends is substantially 90 degrees. Therefore, the claims of this application are patentably distinct from the claims of the '733 patent. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn and no Terminal Disclaimer is needed.

All rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward J. Stemberger  
Registration No. 36,017  
Attorney for Applicant  
Tel. No. (202) 261-1014

Customer No. 24500